

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-2096

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KENNETH CROSSON; ARLEEN L. PRIEPETON,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; PANTONG MANN; LAUREN SHEA;
LOCKHEED MARTIN PC,

Defendants.

No. 02-2260

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ARLEEN L. PRIEPETON; LOCKHEED MARTIN, PC,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; PANTONG MANN; LAUREN SHEA,

Defendants.

No. 02-2261

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ARLEEN L. PRIEPETON; LOCKHEED MARTIN, PC,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; PANTONG MANN; LAUREN SHEA,

Defendants.

No. 02-2402

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ARLEEN L. PRIEPETON; LOCKHEED MARTIN PC;
KENNETH L. CROSSON,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; PANTONG MANN; LAUREN SHEA,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (CA-02-1083-A)

Submitted: January 27, 2003

Decided: March 10, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Afaf Kanazeh, Appellant Pro Se. Geoffrey Martin Bohn, CUNNINGHAM & ASSOCIATES, Arlington, Virginia; Carol Thomas Stone, JORDAN, COYNE & SAVITS, L.L.P., Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Afaf Kanazeh appeals district court orders granting the Appellees' motions to dismiss. We have reviewed the record and the district court orders and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Kanazeh v. Priepeton, No. CA-02-1083-A (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 2, 2002, entered Aug. 5, 2002; filed Aug. 30, 2002, entered Sept. 3, 2002; entered Oct. 21, 2002; filed Nov. 1, 2002, entered Nov. 4, 2002). We deny motions to strike filed in Nos. 02-2096 and 02-2260, the motion for appointment of counsel filed in No. 02-2096, and the motion for general relief seeking to add a new party filed in all appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED